Dear Jim, Wecht, etc. 6/1/75

Yesterday I had a note from Gary Schoener. Much of it is personal, not secret but changes in his life, etc. For your information I'll repeat what he says about "the Wecht thing."

I know Gary's intentions are never other than good, that he is this sort of person. However, I'm not again going to get involved in his judgements. There are three very bad ones that I can recall. Each in a different way was hurtful. Each took a toll I can't forget if I am not bitter about any. Each one separately tells me that I can't risk repetition. Or the great amount of time.

"You were right about the Wecht thing. Even with your words of warning I was not prepared for that horseshit ending to the affair. I became involved despite your warnings because I felt the better heads among us should be represented. Since Wecht was going ahead I felt someone should try to direct the inquiry into more responsible channels. As you know, my time was limited to the point that I just couldn't keep up the debate, so my last effort was spent trying to help Wecht. Cyril promised he would do a detailed scientific article for the critics, which I suggested could be a research publication of the Duquesne Inst. for Forensic Pathology. Then he could consider regular journals. I was told Bob Smith wrote the crap that finally came out. Cyril's findings, many of which I have on tape (which Jerry has), were not really dealt with adequately. Cyril not only never sent me a rough or final draft but didn't even send me the published article. So it was a disappointing outcome, given my hard work and my having approached it giving Wecht, Smith et al the ebenfit of the doubt. At that point, with the incredible demands on my time, you hopping mad (for good reason) [He should have used the plural for there was then also the Ned deal on which he was never responsive] I decided to drop out of things."

I recognize and accept this as a decent gesture if it is also self-serving and a gesture toward his own conscience. He is trying to be honest and he is certainly apologizing and confessing error. The last two are more important to him than to me, but I recognize and appreciate them for what they represent. A careful reading and an attempt to understand if there are omission will indicate his slef needs. There is nothing wrong with this and I'm not being critical. I am saying that he has not yet come completely clean with himself and perhaps he is beginning to try. As an example of personal orientation there is no reflection of the cost of all of this to me, including the consideration of time, which he addresses in self-sympathy. Nor of the extra demands on my time that he personally caused.

My disappointment in Gary as well as my lack of bitterness probably are influenedd by how we felt of him. Back in 1968 we considered him the one to whom we should leave what we have that is of value. There was nothing with which I did not trust him.

I'm not responding. I'm tempted to thank him but among the considgeration that tell me not to is the fact that I just can't let this start up again. It can do no good and it will take time I need for other matters. It is in this sense also better for him. If I can cross over into his expertise, I think it will be better for him if he wonders why I have not responded. Perhaps he will then think this through a little more and come to recognize what he now does not, that his judgement needs less emotional influence on it. If I never told you, he knew things about Ned Crosby that should have prompted him to give me some cautions he never did. Thus on his word I trusted Ned fully. Only afterward, when I had no need for more information, did he tell me some of this. One was a case in which Ned learned, perhaps from Gary, that a shrink was having sexual relations with a married woman patient. Whatever the shrink's motives, it was miserable for Ned to spread it around. It wrecked several lives. It would have been all the warning I needed. He should also have told me how Ned and his wife are about money, especially the wife and her attitude toward Ned's interest in the subject. Also the complications in Ned's life, like that CIA foundation (in which Ned may have had no personal CIA involvement). These represent the kinds of judgements to which we cannot again be in bail. Best,